

Democrats and Trusts.

Written to THE BEE.

It is the general belief of the average Democratic voter, that one of the chief occupations of his party is to camp on the trail of trusts; and to follow after them, "faint, yet pursuing," until they are exterminated, and the places of their former habitations sown with salt. The truth or falsity of this idea is to be determined by the record which the Democratic party has made; and not by the flamboyant, sky-scraping, pot-house politician, who, like the Levite, is hunting for a "place."

But before we go into this record, so nauseating to the olfactories of common honesty, let us use some of the Democratic disinfectant, with which they seek to impregnate the political atmosphere. This preventive is prepared solely by Dr. W. J. Bryan, the great Magnetic Healer; and, if taken with eyes shut, asking no questions, it is warranted to keep off all attacks of Prosperity. We quote from the Democratic platform recently adopted at Kansas City:

They (the trusts) are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiable greed is checked all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed. The dishonest paltering with the trust evil by the Republican party in State and National platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of Republican policies, that they are fostered by Republican laws and that they are protected by the Republican administration.

Thus declares the wind of the Democratic party; now for the more material declaration of that party's record.

In 1888, Democratic leaders in Congress allowed the sugar trust (the only great trust up to that time, except the Standard Oil trust) to dictate the sugar schedule of the Mill's Bill; and this, in turn, brought about the defeat of the Democratic candidate for President that year. Was this trust, which forced a Democratic Congress to pay a gratuitous pension to the sugar planter, "fostered by the Republican laws?" and "protected by the Republican administration?"

Again, in the McKinley Bill of 1900, is the following law against trusts:

Every contract, combination in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal.

Does this sound like trusts are "fostered by Republican laws?" Moreover, this law imposed a fine of \$5,000 and two years imprisonment upon any party or parties violating it, or even attempting to violate it. And this law was passed by Republicans—every Democrat in both houses voting against it. Then with that unmitigated gall and studied disregard for the truth, known to an average Democrat only, they say in their platform that trusts are "fostered by Republican laws;" and that they are "the legitimate product of Republican policies?" In 1894, the Democrats, then in full control, repealed this anti-trust law—EVERY DEMOCRAT VOTING FOR THE REPEAL, AND EVERY REPUBLICAN AGAINST IT. Then with this record, which would shame anything except the Sphinx and a Democrat, they come before the people declaring in a national platform that trusts are "fostered by Republican laws?" That trusts are "the legitimate product of Republican policies?" and that said trusts are "protected by the Republican administration?"

So much for the national record of the two great parties on trusts: now let us notice the State record. Missouri has been under Democratic control for thirty years. Let us notice some of her laws concerning trusts. In section 1834 of the present statutes of that State is the following law:

Any two corporations now existing under general or special laws, or which may hereafter be created, whose object and business are in general of the same nature, may amalgamate, unite and consolidate said corporations and form one consolidated corporation, holding and enjoying all the rights, privileges, powers, franchises and property belonging to each, and under such corporate name as they may adopt or agree upon.

Also, the statutes of Missouri, section 1820, provide that any consolidated corporation may issue stock to the amount of \$100,000,000. And the street railway company of St. Louis is not limited by the law at all! These laws were all passed by a Democratic Legislature, and signed by a Democratic Governor? Does this look like trusts are "the legitimate product of Republican policies?" and "fostered by Republican laws?" Surely, these Missouri trusts have not been "protected by the Republican administration!"

And then there is Augustus Van Wyck, of New York. He made a speech, denouncing trusts, at the Kansas City Convention; and at that moment, he owned 1,100 shares of stock in the Tammany ice trust, and his hands were not yet cold from the passage through them of 4,875 shares, worth \$487,500, which he had just "farmed out." What did this ice trust do? It doubled the cost to the consumer and cut off the sale of five-cent pieces, so that the poorer people could get no ice at all. Yet, this Shillock, Van Wyck, who is at the head of this trust, along with other Democrats, says in the Kansas City platform: "We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in Nation, State and city against private monopoly in every form?" This is as if a thief were to spend the day in declaring to you that he was making war on all thieves, and then steal from you all night. While Van Wyck was in Kansas City, waging a wordy war on trusts, the poor little children in their tenement hovels in hottest New York, were suffering for the little ice which Van Wyck's ice trust had cut them off from.

One more case and we close. It will be remembered by all who are posted (but of course this does not include many Democrats) that the last Congress had under consideration a bill to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to enable the Federal authorities to deal effectively with the great trust problem. The bill was argued, and finally came to a vote. Here was the supreme test to show how the two parties stood on this great question. And what was the sequel? EVERY DEMOCRAT IN CONGRESS, BUT FIVE, VOTED AGAINST THE AMENDMENT; AND EVERY REPUBLICAN, BUT ONE, VOTED FOR IT. The measure was a little short of the necessary two-thirds vote; and so solely through Democratic opposition, it failed to become a law. And then, after all this, that negative set of political mugwumps, known as the Democratic party, comes forward with apparent seriousness, says in its platform that trusts are "fostered by Republican policies?" Then, they further stultify themselves and insult the intelligence of a forbearing people by declaring: "We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in Nation, State and city, against private monopoly in every form"—all of which is a lie, as proved by their record. For as a national policy, they repealed the anti-trust law in the McKinley Bill, and defeated the recent proposed amendment; as a State policy, they have fondled the trusts in Missouri from the beginning as a city policy, we note the ice trust in New York.

Now the above items are facts; are hard things to meet in the road; especially when one has no better armor than falsehood, and no more effective weapon than assertion. The record of the Democratic party shows it to be in favor of trusts. Yet that political weathercock and journalistic chameleon, who edits the Courier-Journal for revenue only, bawls out almost daily about how faithful that party has been in the fight against trusts. But his bawling excites just two things—the echoes of his own voice, and the contempt of thinking people: for the thoughtful have long since ceased to take him seriously. He writes whatever Haldeman tells him to write; and Haldeman tells him to write whatever he thinks will catch the most subscribers.

READY FOR BATTLE.

The Fight for Civil Liberty Will Be Earnestly Waged.

Yerkes and Other Strong Speakers Will Push the Battle to a Finish.

The first active steps in preparation for the coming campaign were taken Monday, in Louisville State campaign committee was perfected. It was decided that the opening gun of the campaign should be fired Saturday, September 1, when Hon. John W. Yerkes will begin a series of speeches. The point where this first speech will be made is yet to be determined, but it will be at some place in southern or western Kentucky.

Chairman Combs and Messrs. Roberts, Welsh, Long and Duty, the other members of the committee, were present at the meeting, which began about noon Monday at the Galt house and occupied the entire afternoon and was in frequent conference with the committee during a portion of its session.

Judge E. C. O'Rear, the Republican nominee for appellate judge in the seventh appellate district, was expected to be present, but owing to an engage-

State will be thoroughly organized. All of the committeemen will be here in Louisville almost constantly except perhaps Mr. Roberts, who will likely attend to the press end of the work from Lexington. As he is one of the most experienced newspaper men in the State, in addition to being one of the best executive managers, it is thought he will make the most efficient man for that branch of the work that the Republicans have ever had.

AT THE GALT HOUSE.

The regular headquarters of the committee will not be opened till August 20. They will be in the four rooms in the southwest corner of the basement of the Galt house, from which in 1896 and again last year, successful campaigns were directed.

Mr. S. S. Shepard, who was secretary of the campaign committee, is strongly tipped for use of the places in headquarters. It is likely he will assist Mr. Long. Mr. J. L. McCoy, of Middlesboro, an old newspaper man, has also, it is understood, been requested to take a post with the committee. The appointment of all assistants will be made later when headquarters are opened up.

A number of general matters in regard to the campaign were

to a flying trip on a special train from which speeches will be made at a number of points with a grand closing rally in Louisville.

OTHER NOTABLE SPEAKERS.

A number of other republicans of the state are expected to take the stump. Ex-Gov. W. O. Bradley, who did so much to win the republican victory of last year, will also be heard.

A suggestion has been made that all the minor state officials, who were robbed of the offices, also take the stump. As the direct victims of Goebelism, they would make strong pleaders on behalf of civil liberty.

In addition to local speakers, who will devote themselves almost entirely to the prime state issue—whether there shall be a free ballot and a fair count—there will be a number of other prominent republican stump speakers from all over the country, who will discuss national issues. Foremost among these will, of course be Hon. Theodore Roosevelt of New York. It is also thought that Senator Thurston, Congressman Dolliver and other campaign orators will be sent here.

"All in all," said Chairman Combs, "the campaign will be one of the warmest that the state has witnessed in some time, although there have been a number of warm ones in the last few years."

Tom Campbell Again Repudiated.

Tom Campbell's brazen conduct during the Powers trial and in fact since that \$100,000 reward fund was appropriated to "hang Taylor and damn the Republican party," was brought to such a desperate and disreputable climax on Saturday that Commonwealth's Attorney Franklin and the Courier-Journal have been forced to practically repudiate him and administer a stinging rebuke.

Defeated at every turn in the Powers case, his perjurers exposed and driven to cover; his star witness branded as a common liar and arrested for perjury Campbell, it is claimed, in order to counteract the effect of the defense's evidence, caused the Courier-Journal and Times to publish a fake confession by Henry E. Youtsey. Campbell vouched for the genuineness of confession, which he claimed was in the form of a signed statement that had been corrected in Youtsey's own hand-writing.

This bold fake put Commonwealth's Attorney Franklin on the defensive. On Friday following the fake story of Combs' alleged confession, Franklin had given Campbell warning in this signed statement:

Combs did make a statement, but no one representing the commonwealth has given it out, and the story published in the paper to which you have called my attention is not a correct report of what Combs had to say. As to what Combs did say, I do not feel that I should make publication of it. My idea of the proper course of conduct for attorneys to pursue in matters of this kind is to present evidence in open court. False stories in newspapers can serve no good purpose, and in my humble opinion should never be published.

ROBERT B. FRANKLIN.

But Campbell did not heed this warning. He was desperate. Then he sprung the Youtsey fake which Commonwealth's Attorney Franklin and Youtsey's counsel repudiate as follows:

Georgetown, Ky., Aug. 4.—The story that Henry Youtsey had made a confession is untrue. Commonwealth's Attorney Franklin says the prosecution has had no statement from Youtsey. Mr. L. J. Crawford and

Col. R. W. Nelson, attorneys for Youtsey, made the following statement tonight:

"All statements in the Courier-Journal of this morning, touching Youtsey and ourselves, are absolutely untrue and unwarranted. We have made no offers to the commonwealth."

R. W. NELSON,
"L. J. CRAWFORD."

So glaring was the bold attempt at Campbell to foist a fake confession on the public that Sunday's Courier-Journal printed a denial of the Youtsey confession and as a slap at Campbell gave him its authority for the lying story.

It is unfortunate for Bob Franklin that he did not repudiate Campbell when the Cincinnati riot man first began the trial of Powers and other Republicans through the Goebel press. It is not to the prosecution's credit that it has permitted Campbell to issue almost daily to the press statements in which he garbled and perverted the evidence, all for the purpose of arousing sentiment hostile to the accused Republicans.

In his statement summing up the case against Powers, as issued to the Goebel press by Campbell, he used the evidence of "Cactus Pete" Weaver, the Denver liar and perjurer, as the basis for the entire case against the defendant. Yet in explaining how the prosecution was "gold bricked" by Weaver, the Courier-Journal says:

"He answered questions put to him in such manner that Commonwealth's Attorney Franklin did not believe the man was telling the truth."

Col. T. C. Campbell suggested that since Weaver's mind was not clear as to certain places and buildings in Frankfort he be sent there to refresh his memory.

Then counsel voted down the suggestion of Col. Campbell and Weaver was put on the stand about an hour later. The attorneys say it was apparent to them after he had been on the stand five minutes that he had never been in Frankfort and that he was deliberately swearing to a falsehood.

Campbell, as well as his colleagues, believed Weaver was lying, yet he was permitted to try to swear Powers' life away.

Campbell must have known Weaver was lying, yet he used the perjurer's story as the basis of his synopsis of the prosecution's evidence against Powers. —Commercial.

He Was Held Up.

Hopkinsville, Ky., Aug. 6.—Broussias Gregory, a young farmer living near Churchill, had a narrow escape from assassination Sunday evening about 8 o'clock while driving along the road near his residence in a buggy. He was attacked by a man who fired four times at him with a pistol. The man, who was a very dark-skinned man or light mulatto, came from a fence corner with a gun in his hand and ordered the man to stop, coming to the buggy and seizing him roughly by the arm. Gregory attempted to pick up his pistol in the bottom of the buggy, and the man opened fire. Two shots passed very close to Gregory, lodging in the buggy back. As soon as he got his own weapon he returned the fire. As the horse jumped forward he left the man in the road. Two other shots were exchanged before the men became separated. It is not known whether the man's motive was robbery or assassination.

Lost.

A pocketbook, containing notes and papers, was lost between the Fair Ground, Madisonville and Earlinton. Pocketbook and contents belong to D. G. Wright. Finder will please return to D. G. Wright, or to BEE office, and receive reward.



THE KANSAS CITY OSTRICH CONCEALS ITSELF.

—Washington Star.

ment, was prevented from coming. Dr. Baker, Collector Sapp and a number of other prominent Republicans came to the temporary quarters during the afternoon and some connected with the committee about different matters.

IN FOUR PORTIONS.

The committee completed its organization by dividing the work into four portions, a committeeman being at the head of the bureau having in charge each of these branches.

Hon. George W. Long, who was at the head of the campaign committee last year, was elected secretary and made head of the speaker's bureau. Editor Sam J. Roberts, of the Lexington Leader, was made chairman of the press bureau, as exclusively tipped in Monday's Commercial. Mr. George W. Welsh, of Danville, will be at the head of the finance bureau. Mr. Chas. H. Duty will have charge of the bureau of organization, which will look after the organization of the party throughout the State. Hon. Leslie Combs will be ex-officio member of all the bureaus.

With the work systematized in this manner and with a splendid executive manager like Mr. Combs to assist and direct all it is thought certain that the

discussed at Monday's meeting, the most important action taken, being the selection of September 1 for the opening of the campaign. This will allow a little more than two months of active campaign work before the election. There is considerable rivalry among different towns of the State for Mr. Yerkes' first speech. The campaign last year was opened at London.

The eleventh district is so loyal however, and rolls up such large Republican majorities that the campaign committee probably thought it would be best to utilize whatever good effect there is from the campaign opening in some other portion of the State where it is more needed. It is said that it is practically settled that either the southern or western part of the State will get the opening of the campaign.

Following the opening speech on September 1, Mr. Yerkes will be on the stump up till the day of election. He will speak every other day and will make, altogether, in the neighborhood of thirty speeches. Two will be allotted to every district and additional ones will be made in certain districts to be determined by the campaign committee.

It is likely that the last week of the campaign will be devoted